Council of the District of Columbia
News Release

City Hall, 14th and E Streets, N.W. Fifth Floor 638-2223 or Government Code 137-3806

February 18, 1975

FOR RELEASE AT 4:00 P.M. TODAY

CITY COUNCILMEMBERS ASK MAYOR FOR DETAILED INFORMATION ON POLITICAL SURVEILLANCE BY D.C. POLICE

Today, Julius W. Hobson asked other members of the City Council to join with him in sending a memorandum to the Mayor requesting that Chief of Police, Maurice Cullinane report fully on political surveillance by D.C. Police Officers.

Councilman Hobson asked that the report include a list of all persons, both D.C. residents and visitors, who were personally followed or watched by police officers for non-criminal reasons by the Police Intelligence Division, and names of those who authorized the surveillance program.

The eleven City Council members who joined with Mr. Hobson in the memorandum also requested that Councilmembers receive complete copies of the final report along with the Mayor.

Councilman Hobson stated "Although I expect the Mayor to cooperate, the City Council has the right to subpoena information and would not hesitate to do so when it comes to protecting the civil rights of both citizens of the District or visitors to the Nation's Capitol."

##########

Council of the District of Columbia
News Release

City Hall, 14th and E Streets, N.W. Fifth Floor 638-2223 or Government Code 137-3806

February 18, 1975

FOR RELEASE AT 4:00 P.M. TODAY

CITY COUNCILMEMBERS ASK MAYOR FOR DETAILED INFORMATION ON POLITICAL SURVEILLANCE BY D.C. POLICE

Today, Julius W. Hobson asked other members of the City Council to join with him in sending a memorandum to the Mayor requesting that Chief of Police, Maurice Cullinane report fully on political surveillance by D.C. Police Officers.

Councilman Hobson asked that the report include a list of all persons, both D.C. residents and visitors, who were personally followed or watched by police officers for non-criminal reasons by the Police Intelligence Division, and names of those who authorized the surveillance program.

The eleven City Council members who jointed with Mr. Hobson in the memorandum also requested that Councilmembers receive complete copies of the final report along with the Mayor.

Councilman Hobson stated "Although I expect the Mayor to cooperate, the City Council has the right to subpoena information and would not hesitate to do so when it comes to protecting the civil rights of both citizens of the District or visitors to the Nation's Capitol.

###########

J-3172-75

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Digitization funded by a generous grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

https://archive.org/details/box43_mayor-wash

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

February 18, 1975

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Walter E. Washington

FROM: City Council Members (signatures below)

SUBJECT: Political Surveillance by D.C. Police Officers

Recent newspaper reports have indicated the possibility of illegal activity by the D.C. Police Department. We are glad to note that Chief of Police Maurice Cullinane has already ordered the Department to prepare a comprehensive report on activities of the Intelligence Division. However, members of the City Council who have signed this memorandum request that specific information be included in Chief Cullinane's report. We also request that complete copies of the report be made available simultaneously to City Council members and to you.

It is unfortunate that, in advance of the report, Chief Cullinane, who has been with the Police Department many years, assured you "I can state in good conscience that at this writing I have no personal knowledge that either the data gathered or the message /methods (?)/ utilized represent activities that would be termed illegal." Since both you and Chief Cullinane occupied positions of authority during the period under investigation, we are sure the citizens of the District would feel more comfortable with an independent review of the facts by the elected City Council and, therefore, we know you will support our efforts to include all pertinent facts in this first report.

Newspapers have already written that Council Member Julius W. Hobson, his wife Tina Hobson, Council Member Marion Barry Jr., and Delegate Walter Fauntroy were all targets of police spying by undercover agents during the late 1960s and early 1970s. When was this type of political surveillance first initiated by the Police Department? Under whose authorization? From that date (or year) until the present, we ask that the following information be included in Chief Cullinane's report:

1. A complete list of all persons (both D.C. residents and visitors) who were named in special ~~non-criminal~~ files consisting of newspaper articles and other published materials maintained by the Police Department considers "criminal" and "non-criminal" (i.e. does "criminal" include such items as parading without a permit, failure to move on, etc.)

A complete list of all persons subjected to other forms of surveillance and observation for non-criminal reasons including, but not limited to, following people around, attending meetings or speeches, wiretapping and use of other eavesdropping or recording devices whether visual or auditory. Be sure to include information on any such surveillance currently being maintained on D.C. elected officials or their families, U.S. Congressmen or on other citizens and visitors in the Nation's Capitol.

2. It is an established fact that former Police Chief Jerry Wilson dealt directly with the Department of Justice and the White House and did not report to you during the months of intensive anti-war activity; therefore, who actually authorized the surveillance of each individual listed above: Chief Wilson? Someone at the White House? CIA? FBI? Justice Department? Provide all copies of documents and policy statements relating to authorization of political surveillance and monitoring as defined under Section One of this memorandum. Were copies of the files given to other agencies?

3. What has happened to each of the files maintained for non-criminal reasons by the police intelligence program? On what date was each file shredded? By whose orders? Provide directives and policy statements for routine destruction of intelligence data. Include all directives and policy statements providing for the routine destruction of all Police Department files.

How about copies now out of hands of police?

4. Which demonstrators were denied permits because of information provided by the police intelligence program? What reasons were given for each denial? Were such groups informed of the reasons? Who made the decision in each case? Provide records.

5. What has been the total cost (provide figures on an annual basis) of the police intelligence program covering non-criminal activity? How many police officers (hours) were involved? How was the cost justified? Provide all documents relating to the police intelligence program focus and goals. What information was discovered through this form of political intelligence gathering that could not have been learned from other sources?

It is very easy for top Department officials to say "To my knowledge...nothing illegal has happened...". Is there a possibility that significant activities or generalized practices exist which Chief Cullinane doesn't know about? What kinds of controls and audit mechanisms have been established by the Department which would prevent illegal activity on the part of specific officers. If any illegal activity actually occurred, the Department report should indicate who was responsible. Was there supervisory negligence? What were the reasons?

The City Council has an immediate obligation to investigate the possible violation of the civil rights of citizens by the D.C. Police Department. Chief Cullinane's report is the first step and will determine how intensive the Council's investigation should be. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving copies of the complete report no later than the first week in March.

Julius W. Hobson

Julius W. Hobson

Draft

(to be signed by all City Council members interested and presented by Julius as an item of intormation at the Council meeting 2/18--and given by him to members of audience and press with cover press release)

MEMORANDUM 2/18

TO: Mayor Walter Washington

FROM: Signatures Below

SUBJECT: Political Surveillance by D. C. Police Officers

Recent newspaper reports have indicated the possibility of illegal activity by the D. C. Police Department. We are glad to note that Chief of Police Maurice Cullinane has already ordered Chief Theodore R. Zanders to prepare a comprehensive report on activities of the Department's Intelligence Division, ~~from January 1967 to date.~~

However, members of the City Council who have signed this memorandum request that the following specific information be included in Chief Cullinane's report. We also request that complete copies of the report be made available simultaneously to City Council members and to the Executive Branch.

It is unfortunate that, in advance of the report, Chief Cullinane, who has been with the Police Department many years, assured you "I can state in good conscience that at this writing I have no personal knowledge that either the data gathered or the message (methods(?)) utilized represent activities that would be termed illegal". Since both you and Chief Cullinane occupied positions of authority during the period under investigation, I am sure the citizens of the District ~~will~~ would feel more comfortaable with an independent review of the facts by the City Council and therefore we are sure you will support our efforts to include all pertinent facts in the final report.

Newspapers have already reported that Council members Julius Hobson, his wife Tina Hobson, Marion Barry Jr., and Del. Walter Fauntroy were all targets of police spying by undercover agents during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Please include a complete list of all other persons (both D. C. residents and visitors) who were:

- o personally surveilled for non-criminal reasons as part of the police intelligence program, or

- o named in special non-criminal files maintained by the police intelligence program. Provide your definition of what is considered "criminal" and "non-criminal" (i.e. does "criminal" include such items as perading without a permit, failure to move on, etc.)

It is a widely accepted fact that former Police Chief Jerry Wilson delt directly with the White House during the months of intensive anti-war activity; therefore, who

between January 1, 1967 and the present

Are any files now being maintained on any elective officers of D.C. Government citizens?

(to be signed by all City Council members interested and presented by Julius as an item of information at the Council meeting 2\18--and given by him to members of audience and press with cover press release)

MEMORANDUM 2\18

TO: Mayor Walter Washington

[illegible]

SUBJECT: Political Surveillance by D. C. Police Officers

Recent newspaper reports have indicated the possibility of illegal activity by the D. C. Police Department. We are glad to note that Chief of Police Maurice Cullinane has already ordered Chief Theodore R. Sanders to prepare a comprehensive report on activities of the Department's Intelligence Division from January 1967 to date.

However, members of the City Council who have signed this memorandum request that the following specific information be included in Chief Cullinane's report. We also request that complete copies of the report be made available simultaneously to City Council members and to the Executive Branch.

It is unfortunate that, in advance of the report, Chief Cullinane, who has been with the Police Department many years, assured you("I can state in good conscience that at this writing I have no personal knowledge that ;either the data gathered or the message ?methods(?)\ utilized represent activities that would be termed illegal". Since both you and Chief Cullinane occupied positions of authority during the period under investigation, I am sure the citizens of the District of Col more comfortable with an independent review of the facts by the City Council, and therefore,we are sure you will support our efforts to include all pertinent facts in the final report.

Newspapers have already reported that Council member Julius Hobson, his wife Tina Hobson, Marion Barry Jr., and Del. Walter Fauntroy were all targets of police spying by undercover agents during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Please include a complete list of all other persons (both D. C. residents and visitors) who were:

- personally surveilled for non-criminal reasons as part of the police intelligence program, or
- named in special non-criminal files maintained by the police intelligence program. Provide your definition of what is considered "criminal" and a "non-criminal" (i.e. does "criminal" include such items as parading without a permit, failure to move on, etc.)

It is a [illegible]ected fact that former police Chief Jerry Wilson met directly with the White House during the months of intensive anti-war activity; therefore, who

someone at

actually authorized the surveillance of the specific individuals listed: Chief Wilson? The White House? CIA? FBI?

What has happened to each of the files maintained for non-criminal reasons by the police intelligence program? Which have been shredded? What has happened to the others?

What has been the total cost of the Police Intelligence program covering non-criminal activity. What part of this cost related to political surveillance?

2. It is an established fact that former Police Chief Jerry Wilson delt directly with the Department of Justice and the White House and did not report to you during the months of intensive anti-war activity; therefore, who actually authorized the surveillance of each individual listed above: Chief Wilson? Someone at the White House? CIA? FBI? Justice Department? Provide all copies of documents and policy statements relating to authorization of political surveillance and monitoring as defined under [illegible]

3. What has happened to each of the files maintained for non-criminal reasons by the police intelligence program? On what date was each file shredded? By whose orders? Provide directives and policy statements for routine distruction of intelligence data. Include all directives and policy statements providing for the routine distruction of all Police Department files.

4. Which demonstrators were denied permits because of information provided by the police intelligence program? What reasons were given for each denial? Were such groups informed of the reasons? Who made the decision in each case? Provide records.

5. What has been the total cost (provide figures on an annual basis) of the police intelligence program covering non-criminal activity? How many police officers (hours) were involved? How was the cost justified? Provide all documents relating to program focus and goals. What information was discovered through this form of intelligence gathering that could not have been learned from other sources?

It is very easy for top Department officials to say "To my knowledge... nothing illegal has happened. .". Is there a possibility that significant activities or generalized practices exist which Chief Cullinane doesn't know about? What kinds of controls and audit mechanisms have been established by the Department which would prevent illegal activity on the part of specific officers. If any illegal activity occurred, the Chief's report should indicate who was responsible? Was there supervisory negligence? What were the reasons?

The City Council has an immediate obligation to investigate the possible violation of the civil rights of citizens by the D.C. Police Department. Chief Cullinane's report is the first step and will determine how intensive the Council's investigation should be. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving copies of the complete report no later than the first week in March.

Julius W. Hobson

Attach only for
Meeting Council
meeting (after
memo delivered
to Mayor)

not to be sent
by Julius to Jeffrey
for the Week.

Councilman

list of all persons, both D. C.

followed or watched by police officers

minal records.

?

City Council

ns or the

~~Not to be eliminated~~

~~the possibility of future legal action.~~

Recommendations

Which were denied permits because of information from intelligence bureau. What were reasons last during a War groups informed of reasons Who made decisions? Proved wrong

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

February 18, 1975

MEMORANDUM TO: MAYOR WALTER E. WASHINGTON

FROM: CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS (signatures below)

SUBJECT: Political Surveillance by D.C. Police Officers

Recent newspaper reports have indicated the possibility of illegal activity by the D.C. Police Department. We are glad to note that Chief of Police Maurice Cullinane has already ordered the Department to prepare a comprehensive report on activities of the Intelligence Division. However, members of the City Council who have signed this memorandum request that specific information be included in Chief Cullinane's report. We also request that complete copies of the report be made available simultaneously to City Council members and to you.

It is unfortunate that, in advance of the report, Chief Cullinane, who has been with the Police Department many years, assured you "I can state in good conscience that at this writing I have no personal knowledge that either the data gathered or the message /methods (?)/ utilized represent activities that would be termed illegal". Since both you and Chief Cullinane occupied positions of authority during the period under investigation, we are sure the citizens of the District would feel more comfortable with an independent review of the facts by the elected City Council and, therefore, we know you will support our efforts to include all pertinent facts in this first report.

Newspapers have already written that Councilmember Julius W. Hobson, his wife Tina Hobson, Councilmember Marion Barry Jr., and Delegate Walter Fauntroy were all targets of police spying by undercover agents during the late 1960s and early 1970s. When was this type of political surveillance first initiated by the Police Department? Under whose authorization? From that date (or year) until the present, we ask that the following information be included in Chief Cullinane's report:

1. A complete list of all persons (both D.C. residents and visitors) who were named in special non-criminal files consisting of newspaper articles and other published materials maintained by the Police Department intelligence program. Provide a definition of what the Police Department considers "criminal" and "non-criminal" (i.e. does "criminal" include such items as parading without a permit, failure to move on, etc.).

A complete list of all persons subjected to other forms of surveillance and observation for non-criminal reasons including, but not limited to, following people around, attending meetings or speeches, wiretapping and use of other eavesdropping or recording devices whether visual or auditory. Be sure to include information on any

ed

such surveillance currently being maintained on D.C. elected officials or their families, U.S. Congressmen or on other citizens and visitors in the Nation's Capitol.

2. It is an established fact that former Police Chief Jerry Wilson dealt directly with the Department of Justice and the White House and did not report to you during the months of intensive anti-war activity; therefore, who actually authorized the surveillance of each individual listed above: Chief Wilson? Someone at the White House? CIA? FBI? Justice Department? Provide all copies of documents and policy statements relating to authorization of political surveillance and monitoring as defined under Section One of this memorandum.

3. What has happened to each of the files maintained for non-criminal reasons by the police intelligence program? On what date was each file shredded? By whose orders? Were copies of the files given to other agencies? Provide directives and policy statements for routine destruction of intelligence data. Include all directives and policy statements providing for the routine destruction of all Police Department files.

4. Which demonstrators were denied permits because of information provided by the police intelligence program? What reasons were given for each denial? Were such groups informed of the reasons? Who made the decision in each case? Provide records.

5. What has been the total cost (provide figures on an annual basis) of the police intelligence program covering non-criminal activity? How many police officers (hours) were involved? How was the cost justified? Provide all documents relating to the police intelligence program focus and goals. What information was discovered through this form of political intelligence gathering that could not have been learned from other sources?

It is very easy for top Department officials to say "To my knowledge...nothing illegal has happened...". Is there a possibility that significant activities or generalized practices exist which Chief Cullinane doesn't know about? What kinds of controls and audit mechanisms have been established by the Department which would prevent illegal activity on the part of specific officers. If any illegal activity actually occurred, the Department report should indicate who was responsible. Was there supervisory negligence? What were the reasons?

The City Council has an immediate obligation to investigate the possible violation of the civil rights of citizens by the D.C. Police Department. Chief Cullinane's report is the first step and will determine how intensive the Council's investigation should be. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving copies of the complete report no later than the first week in March.

Julius W. Hobson — Arrington Dixon — John Wilson

David A. Clarke — James E. Coates — William Spaulding

Marion Barry — Willie J. Hardy

Polly Shackleton — Jerry A. Moore, Jr.

Nadine Winter

ed

THE WASHINGTON POST
Wednesday, February 19, 1975

Council Asks Specific Data On D.C. Police Surveillance

By Linda Newton Jones
Washington Post Staff Writer

The D.C. City Council yesterday sent to Mayor Walter E. Washington a list of questions it would like answered in the forthcoming report on the intelligence-gathering activities of the D.C. police department.

Included among the questions was one about the estimated total cost of the intelligence program and another on the degree of control department officials have over the activities of individual officers in order to prevent illegal investigations.

The Council asked that it receive copies of the department's report no later than the first week in March. Members said the report would provide the basis for a possible Council investigation into intelligence activities of the department.

D.C. Police Chief Maurice Cullinane ordered the internal investigation into the activities of the department's intelligence division last week after it was reported that city police maintained files on the personal lives of antiwar activists and some local politicians.

At-large City Councilman Julius Hobson, who was reported to have been included in the police files, led the Council in its move to obtain the information.

Hobson told the Council at its committee-of-the-whole meeting yesterday that he planned to ask the mayor for a copy of the report and for the additional information on the department. The Council endorsed Hobson's move and all members except Chairman Sterling Tucker signed a memorandum he delivered to the mayor.

Tucker told the Council that he had already conferred with the mayor concerning the report and did not feel he should petition him for the information. He said he already has "the assurances of the mayor" that the Council will receive the information.

Ward One Councilman David A. Clarke said he believes he was under surveillance by the police in 1971 when a woman, who was later revealed to be a police officer, joined a group he headed at that time, the D. C. Freedom and Independence Day Committee.

He said Ward Seven Council member Willie Hardy also was on the committee.

Recent reports of the intelligence activities of the department revealed that at-large Councilman Marion Barry and D.C. Del. Walter Fauntroy were included in police files.

Council members said in the memo that they are confident the mayor would support their quest for additional information since "we are sure the citizens of the District would feel more comfortable with an independent review of the acts by the elected City Council."

The Council asked that the report also include a complete list of all persons named in special noncriminal files and a list of persons who were subjected to other forms of surveillance for noncriminal reasons. Members also want to know who authorized the surveillances, who ordered the destruction of the files, and whether the information was used by other government agencies.

JULIUS HOBSON SR.
. . . supported by Council

ed

Council of the District of Columbia
News Release

City Hall, 14th and E Streets, N.W. Fifth Floor 638-2223 or Government Code 137-3806

February 18, 1975

FOR RELEASE AT 4:00 P.M. TODAY

CITY COUNCILMEMBERS ASK MAYOR FOR DETAILED INFORMATION ON POLITICAL SURVEILLANCE BY D.C. POLICE

Today, Julius W. Hobson asked other members of the City Council to join with him in sending a memorandum to the Mayor requesting that Chief of Police, Maurice Cullinane report fully on political surveillance by D.C. Police Officers.

Councilman Hobson asked that the report include a list of all persons, both D.C. residents and visitors, who were personally followed or watched by police officers for non-criminal reasons by the Police Intelligence Division, and names of those who authorized the surveillance program.

The eleven City Council members who joined with Mr. Hobson in the memorandum also requested that Councilmembers receive complete copies of the final report along with the Mayor.

Councilman Hobson stated "Although I expect the Mayor to cooperate, the City Council has the right to subpoena information and would not hesitate to do so when it comes to protecting the civil rights of both citizens of the District or visitors to the Nation's Capitol."

##########

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004

March 11, 1975

Dear

A belated thank you for your support to my successful campaign for City Council Member-at-Large.

This support is most appreciated. I hope, we can continue to work toward those goals of freedom and justice which have brought all of us together over the years.

You may be interested in the enclosed memorandum I initiated and sent to the Mayor -- a first step. Also mark your calendar for Friday evening the 4th of April -- we are planning a special activity.

Sincerely,

Julius W. Hobson
Council Member-at-Large

Enclosure

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004

REPORT ANALYSIS

POLICE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES REPORT, MARCH 7, 1975

What follows is an analysis of Section VIII of Chief Cullinane's Report to you of March 7, 1975: "Response to Questions Posed in the Memorandum dated February 18, 1975 addressed to Mayor Walter E. Washington from City Council Members and entitled "Political Surveillance by D.C. Police Officers."

1A) Q. "Complete list of all persons... named in special non-criminal files."

A. "The major portion of such files has been destroyed..."

Analysis: This answer is not responsive and raises the following further questions:

If "the major portion" of these files have been destroyed, it follows that the balance must remain. How many remain?

Who do they identify?

Why were the officers who were interviewed (Cullinane Memo to Mayor Washington, March 7, 1975, p.1) not asked to recollect what information they could regarding the destroyed "major portion" of the files described? Why cannot they be asked now?

1B) Q. "Complete list of all persons subjected to other forms of surveillance and observation for non-criminal reasons, including...wiretapping and...other eavesdropping or recording devices..."

A. (In effect) The question is too broad to give complete answer. Police filmed or observed demonstration activities, some attended by up to 250,000 people.

"Records were kept of meetings to other events attended by (agents) of the Intelligence Division...(U)nder cover officials and special employees monitored various organizational meetings and in some instances joined the organization to facilitate the process. Undercover officers were assigned to various college campuses as full-time students. Activity reports were subsequently filed by all officers and special employees." Files since destroyed were kept on Fauntroy, Tucker, Barry, Hardy, Hobson and Moore.

Analysis: This answer is also evasively unresponsive and raises the following further questions:

Are there sections of films that show individual demonstrators? Were these films used in adding to individual dossiers? How many officers were assigned to undercover demonstration work and to filming demonstrations? At what cost?

What meetings did undercover agents attend? How many? What is the substance of the activity reports they filed? Where are the remaining activity reports? Who do these reports identify?

Which college campuses were infiltrated, and by whom? Who paid the tuition of the infiltrators? Where are their reports? Who do these reports identify?

What organizations were joined, and which were monitored by the Police Department? Supply a list of such organizations with a brief explanation of why each was selected for surveillance. Where are the reports filed on these organizations? Who was identified in these reports?

2. Q. ..."who actually authorized the surveillance of each individual listed above...? Provide all copies of documents and policy statements relating to authorization of political surveillance and monitoring as defined under Section One of this memorandum."

   A. Former Chief Wilson or other government officials can "best" respond directly to this question. Documents and policy statements are attached as Attachments A,B,C,D,E,F, G, H and I.

Analysis: Again, evasion instead of a responsible answer:

a) As to responding "directly" to this question: Chief Wilson could not personally have supervised and carried out all the surveillance that occurred; other police officials and officers were involved:

Who are the other police officials?

Who are the other police officers?

Were they interviewed before the answer to this question was prepared? Who interviewed each such officer?

Were they asked who authorized their surveillance work?

Was former Police Chief Wilson interviewed in connection with the preparation of this answer? Was Assistant Chief Theodore R. Zanders interviewed?

Can it really be true that no one now in the Department knows "who actually authorized the surveillance"?

b) As to the documents and policy statements (Attachments A-I) they do not supply the information requested. They are merely Departmental memoranda on the organization of the Intelligence Unit and on policies and organization, with excerpts from federal and local law. This cannot be the full documentary record.

There is not a single word relating to a particular surveillance, a particular wiretap, a particular organizational infiltration. It is unbelievable that all particular orders issued pursuant to the policies embodied in Attachments A-I were issued orally.

Where are the orders (or applications) in the case of some wiretapping?

Who issued or authorized them?

Whom do they identify?

3. Q. (in relevant part) "What has happened to each of the files maintained for non-criminal reasons by the police intelligence program?... Were copies of the files given to other agencies?"

A. (in relevant part) "Beginning in March or April of 1974, a process to purge the non-criminal files of the Intelligence Division commenced. This is an ongoing process and the files have been reduced by approximately 80 percent at this writing." In part destroyed was:..."A large block of Intelligence Division files on organizations involved in various protest and demonstration activities. These files relate to the structure of the organization, activities engaged in, and reports on various meetings. This file is presently being purged and in all probability will be destroyed..."

"The Intelligence Division does not routinely forward information to other law enforcement agencies, however, it does respond to specific requests for information." (Emphasis supplied)

Analysis: There are three points to be made here:

a) 80% of what? 80% of the quantity of materials gathered, in terms of actual pages; or 80% of the number of files opened, without regard to the thickness of any one? Percentages aside, how many files, in actual numbers were destroyed? How many still exist?

b) What is the difference between "purging" a file and "destroying" it? Are the purged files retained? On what basis have the remaining files been maintained? Whom or what do they identify? Under what standards or guidelines do they retain relevance to law enforcement?

c) The question was whether copies of these files were given "to other agencies," not to other "law enforcement agencies." Were they given to non-law enforcement agencies such as the CIA, the DIA, the Civil Service Commission, other D.C. Departments and Agencies?

As to responding to specific requests for information from other law enforcement agencies: which agencies requested such information? What was given to the particular agency in response to such requests? How many such requests were there from 1967 to 1974? When the Police Department began destroying these files, did they request the agencies to whom they had disseminated this information to return the records? Under what authority or standards was the information disseminated to other law enforcement agencies?

4. Q. "Which demonstrators were denied permits because of information provided by the police intelligence program?..."

A. "There is no evidence to reveal that the Metropolitan Police Department has ever denied any person or group a permit due to information provided by the Intelligence Division or for any other reason..."

Analysis: What is the information in applications used for? What is the information in demonstrations used for? Are groups or demonstrations evaluated or characterized before or after a demonstration, and in what terms. List groups and/or demonstrations, with such evaluation or category.

List all demonstrations from 1967 to 1974 in D.C. in which the D.C. Police Department had responsibility for permits.

How many were anti-war or political demonstrations? Of these, how many were granted (a) two weeks before demonstration or more? (b) one week before or more? (c) less than a week but more than 3 days? (d) less than three days but more than 24 hours? (e) 24 hours or less?

What restrictions were placed on these as to size, route, place, time, other?

How many were non-political demonstrations? (e.g. Cherry Blossom festival). Describe time of granting permits in the same categories as above. Describe restrictions placed on these as to size, route, place, time, other, as above.

Supply copies of permits to document these answers.

5. Q. Total cost of ID non-criminal program. Total police officer hours involved. Justification of cost. Documents relating to intelligence program focus and goals. What otherwise unavailable information was obtained by political intelligence work?

A. Costs: See Attachments K and J for costs figures 1968-75.

Justifications: 1) D.C. Crime Commission recommended it, and D.C. government directed implementation of the recommendation. 2) "Valid strategic intelligence data would predict the size of demonstrations and probability of disorder and the degree of anticipated... the department would not have to overplan manpower reserves..." The Department's success in managing major demonstrations was "accomplished in large part because those involved in planning, and those who carried out those plans, were provided concrete data which facilitated the decision making process and maintained a balance of control (avoiding) overreaction or underreaction."

Documents: (None supplied.)

Other Sources of Information: "No one will never know what other sources would have produced."

Analysis: Costs: Attachment J "Allocation of Confidential Funds 1968-75," is all but unintelligible, and in any event does not appear to respond to the question of what the total costs of the ID non-criminal program has been; it speaks only to the allocation of "confidential funds" and apparently does not cover personnel costs or indeed other categories of expense.

The Attachment's basic flaw is that the numbers (other than the percentages) are incomprehensible.

For example, in fiscal 1972 "200.0" was "Appropriated," "197.0" was "Obligated," "5.4" was "Grant Funds," and "70.5" was the "Subversive Amount." What do these numbers mean? The percentage figures are also confusing.

For example, the 1972 "Subversive Amount" figure was "70.5" is listed as "35%" of the "Department Total." What "Department Total"? Of "Confidential Funds"? Of the entire departmental budget?

The only fact that does emerge clearly from Attachment J is that the "70.5" subversive amount figure was 100% of the funds allocated to the Intelligence Division, meaning that not one penny was spent on another of the Division's concerns, organized crime, in 1972.

The figures on Attachment K, "Distribution of Personnel and personnel costs of Intelligence Program 1968-75," are somewhat more illuminating. They show that in the '68-'75 period $2,341,000 were spent on personnel in the security investigation branch, while only $504,000 was spent on organized crime.1/

They further show that between 1968 and 1970 over $650,000 was spent on security investigation personnel while absolutely nothing was spent on organized crime personnel. In 1971 four persons became the nucleus of the organized crime staff, at a cost of $55,800, while the security investigations personnel costs in that same year jumped almost 28% to $353,600.

1/ It appears that some of the "security investigation" personnel costs were not allocated to non-criminal investigations. Attachment L (which the main text of the Cullinane report mysteriously fails to mention at all) indicates that between 1968 and 1975, a total of $1,751,075 was spent on "non-criminal manpower" while $582,750 was allocated to "criminal manpower." Someone should explain the difference in this regard between Attachment K and Attachment L. Whichever figures reflect the actual facts, the imbalance of personnel costs between non-criminal and criminal intelligence operations remains gross and suggest utterly disordered priorities within the Department.

While this gross imbalance was somewhat rectified in succeeding years, the fact remains that in 1975 well over half of all Intelligence Division personnel costs are attributable to security investigations ($207,352 compared with $147,724 for the Organized Crime Branch and $47,024 for the Special Officer Branch, which does such things as investigate applications for licenses of detective agencies).

One must ask who set or sets these priorities, and after what kind of analysis and consultation?

Justifications:

(a) D.C. Crime Commission Report: Chief Cullinane's report relies heavily in this answer in its very opening pages on the fact that the D.C. Crime Commission noted the fact of potential domestic violence and disturbances in the 1960's. This seeming endorsement, by the Crime Commission, of political surveillance; is disingenuous. In the 41 recommendations made by the D.C. Crime Commission on the operations of the Metropolitan Police Department (Chapter 4, President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia, pages 142-229) not a single one is a recommendation for the establishment of an Intelligence Unit. The Commission appeared more concerned with organized crime, particularly as it bore on hard drug usage and crime related thereto.

(b) National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders:

Chief Cullinane's report also relies on the National Advisory Commission's report to justify political surveillance (Cullinane Report, p.4) quoting this Commission's recommendation for creation of an undercover unit. This is similarly taken out of context.

The recommendations in the National Advisory Commission Report in chapters 11 and 12 are devoted to easing police-community tensions in the ghetto, and are in the specific context of unplanned eruptions in high-tension areas.

A summary of some of these 14 recommendations in these two chapters establishes that context:

*Ensure proper conduct by police officers and eliminate abrasive practices in the ghetto.

*More adequate police protection to ghetto residents.

*Fair and effective mechanisms for the redress of grievances against the police.

*Recruit more Negroes into the police force and ensure fair promotion for Negro officers.

*Develop continuing contacts with ghetto residents to make use of the forces for order which exist.

Neither the recommendation quoted by Chief Cullinane, nor any of the others has anything to do with peaceful, legal pre-planned demonstrations. No social alchemy can transmute the call for information about potential domestic violence into a justification for political surveillance of peaceful protest.

(c) The report states that the police were able to avoid loss of life and serious property damage during major demonstrations because intelligence work produced "concrete data" permitting prophylactic police action. What "concrete data?" Not a single illustration is offered. This omission becomes the more notable in view of Attachment M, "Accomplishments of Intelligence Division as result of crime-oriented objectives," which recites some 21 situations in which as a result of intelligence work the law was effectively enforced against drug dealers, arms smugglers, fences, call girls, counterfeiters, burglars and persons illegally possessing firearms. Where are the parallel successes in the area of non-criminal intelligence?

Documents: The answer supplies none of the requested documents "relating to the police intelligence program focus and goals," and refers to none. If this means that all necessary documents have already been supplied under Attachments A-I, that is an inadequate response for the reasons set forth above in the Analysis to Question #2. If it means that the authors of the report choose to ignore the inquiry, the act of ignoring should itself be inquired into.

Other Potential Sources of Information: The answer here--that "one will never know what other /non-intelligence/ sources could have produced" -- amounts to a baldly unapologetic admission that the police do not bother to seek information in ways other than by infiltration, eavesdropping, wiretapping, secret filming and similarly covert monitoring. In an age when the Constitution is understood to compel the government to employ "the least drastic means" and "the least restrictive alternative"1/ in seeking information, lest First Amendment freedoms of speech and association be compromised and chilled, such an admission shows an appalling lack of devotion to preservation of civil liberties.

1/ See, e.g., NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958); Shelton v. Tucker, 364 U.S. 479 (1960).

March 10, 1975

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Walter Washington

THROUGH: Julian Dugas, City Administrator

FROM: Julius W. Hobson, Councilmember-at-large

SUBJECT: Police Chief Cullinane's Report on Police Surveillance Activities of District of Columbia Police Officers

I respectfully request that a copy of Chief Cullinane's report be forwarded to me as soon as possible after it is available.

Thank you for your consideration.

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004

April 11, 1975

The Honorable
Mayor Walter Washington
The District Building
14th and E Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mayor Washington:

This is to convey to you our concern that the report furnished to you by Chief Cullinane on March 7, 1975 on police intelligence activities, and in response to the questions set out in our memorandum to you of February 18, 1975, fails to furnish the information necessary to justify appropriations of funds for further support of non-criminal intelligence activities.

We have attached a report analysis, setting out in detail the inadequacies of Chief Cullinane's responses to our questions, and indicating the further information that needs to be furnished.

But apart from the individual items of information that were not furnished, we wish to express to you four overriding concerns about Chief Cullinane's report and other public disclosures of the political surveillance activities of the Police Department.

First, Chief Cullinane's report is evasive. Choosing to play it "close to the vest", he has placed distortingly narrow interpretations on each request for information, then responded in the most cryptic and generalized terms. We believe that evasion, non-responsiveness and obfuscation are inappropriate. The Chief of Police should accept the fact that he and the Department are accountable, and should answer our concerns and questions with the utmost detail and clarity.

We ask that you direct Chief Cullinane to prepare a report that supplies the information requested, that reflects an attitude of maximum disclosure, that opens the windows on the heretofore shadowy surveillance operations of the Police Department -- in short, a full report that will enable the City Council to exercise its responsibilities respecting the Police Department's budget and good conduct.

Second, Chief Cullinane's report offers not a single concrete instance of benefits from the non-criminal intelligence program. The report states, in vague terms, that the police were able to avoid loss of life and serious property damage during major demonstrations because the intelligence operation produced"concrete data" that permitted police planning and preventive actions. These vague statements, unsupported by any specific facts, stand in striking contrast to the twenty-one specific instances, listed in the report (Attachment M), in which intelligence activities with "crime-oriented objectives" resulted in effective law enforcement action against drug dealers, arms smugglers, fences, counterfeiters, burglars, etc.

As Chief Cullinane's report now stands, there is a complete lack of justification for funds for intelligence activities for non-crime related objectives.

Third, the report discloses that through 1973 the Police Department spent large portions of the total Department budget on investigating subversive activities, while, at the same time, spending very little on organized crime (Attachment L). This indicates so severe a misallocation of Police Department resources as to bring the judgment and priorities of the responsible officials into serious question. We, therefore, ask for a full and detailed explanation of the disparity between expenditures for organized crime and political surveillance, or, in the alternative, an acknowledgement of error and a specification of steps designed to ensure against such misallocation in the future.

Finally, a March 20, 1975, report in the Washington Post of an interview with Inspector Albert W. Ferguson attributes to him statements, among others, that: (i) a high ranking police official once proposed that the police burn a demonstration display; and (ii) police undercover informers receive "tax free" money from the Police Department. These statements indicate possible criminal actions, namely, solicitation to commit arson, and violation of federal tax laws. In addition, the failure of those with knowledge of these matters to report them officially and to initiate appropriate law enforcement and Departmental disciplinary action, also constitutes possible criminal conduct or breach of Departmental discipline.

Accordingly, we ask that you initiate an investigation, outside of the Police Department, to determine whether criminal and disciplinary offenses occurred in these two matters, whether there was complicity (through malfeasance or non-feasance) by high ranking Police Department officials, whether Chief Wilson or Chief Cullinane had knowledge, and whether Chief Cullinane initiated any action prior to or after the Post's March 20th report. At the same

time, we are asking the United States Attorney to investigate these two matters to determine whether criminal prosecutions should be instituted.

We ask a prompt response to the four requests in this letter and to the requests for information in the attached memorandum. We ask that these responses be received prior to April 15, 1975, the date of the first reading of the budget bill.

Sincerely,

Attachments

Julius W. Hobson
Councilmember Julius Hobson

Arrington Dixon
Councilmember Arrington Dixon

Sterling Tucker
Chairman Sterling Tucker

Councilmember Willie Hardy

Doug Moore
Chairman Pro tem Doug Moore

Jerry A. Moore, Jr.
Councilmember Jerry Moore

Marion Barry
Councilmember Marion Barry

Polly Shackleton
Councilmember Polly Shackleton

David A. Clarke (P.S.B)
Councilmember David Clarke

Councilmember William Spaulding

James E. Coates
Councilmember James Coates

John Wilson
Councilmember John Wilson

Nadine Winter
Councilmember Nadine Winter

May 5, 1975

Honorable Walter E. Washington
Mayor of the District of Columbia
District Building, 14th & E Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mayor Washington:

I have received an inquiry from the D.C. Retired Teachers Association concerning their retirement fund. I would like a full report on the investment policies for this fund and over sight of its management.

I has been brought to my attention that other cities and states have Boards of Trustees. Is a similar plan proposed for the D.C. Teachers Retirement Fund. What is the proposed make up of such a board?

Please provide background information on this issue including a summary of actions taken to date and further steps you plan to take. I would like this information by May 1975.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

JULIUS W. HOBSON
Councilmember-at-large

Harmon Jones - National Retired Teachers

1

D.C. Colored Teacher's Association

3001 Conn. Ave. 20008

— Mrs. Elizabeth Duff Fleming — EM-2-7479

— Mrs. Anita B. Jones — 3145 Adams Pl. 20015
WO6-3145

Pension Fund $1 million

retirement funds

Mr. Krauss - Comm. Appeals - pres.

teachers retirement funds investment procedure

Corporation Counsel's ruling

investment investments, city banks

Common stock real estate

mutual funds

U.S. Treasury - 1946 amendment

* Secretary of the Treasury funds?

1970

Treasurer

Mayor's Office
Martha Van Landingham
629-2465

Mayor - issue of investment

John Colbert (*Mr. Cole?)

D.C. Accounting Office

Mrs. Dunn (Judges books (no investment on local funds

not exactly sounds good

Portfolio — Fiscal Fiscal Year
Sup't Wenner cash flow ?
Frank Cash — returns/contributions by teachers
Corrective Process
Ed. Wenner — informed — the figure
from DC Accounting

"Flower" bonds Purchased at a discount

Legislative Need
Board of Trustees ⇒
Teachers, retired under
current authority (private)
Wil Jack Tennant Teacher Retirement
Cole System (booklet)

Judges Retirement Fund ⊃ Civil Service Commission
Treasurer Fisherman - gets an operating fund

February 27, 1975

Honorable Walter E. Washington
Mayor of the District of Columbia
District Building, 14th & E Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C., 20004

Dear Mayor Washington:

The recent news reports of the "Mayor's Legislative Program" prompted questions by the D. C. Retired Teachers Association which led us to the office of Mr. William Krause to seek information regarding any possible changes in the administration of the D. C. Teachers Retirement Fund, now deposited with the United States Treasurer. We found Mr. Krause most helpful in describing the current status of the fund and the assignment undertaken by his committee, including the underlying rationale and major objectives. He reported that specific plans would be completed within two weeks and forwarded to you prior to any public release of detailed information. In this regard we are most eager to have a conference with you before your decisions are finalized for presentation to the City Council.

Both active and retired teachers are deeply concerned about the security of their retirement funds in the event that they are reinvested in Corporate Bonds and Common Stocks. Do you feel that there is any danger in changing the investment policy of the D. C. Teachers Retirement Fund during this time of inflation and deepening recession? What consideration is being given to investment in U. S. Treasury Securities bearing interest rates of six, seven, eight, or nine percent?

In our investigations we have discovered that cities and states have Boards of Trustees to control and manage investments and to ensure the safety of retirement systems. Is a similar plan envisioned for the District of Columbia Government?

May we have a conference with you at your earliest convenience to discuss these and related questions? At such a meeting you may wish to include the group who met with Mr. Krause on February 19, 1975. The persons listed below were in attendance:

Miss Elizabeth D. Griffith, Pres., D.C. Retired Teachers Ass'n
Mrs. Roberta S. Barnes, Legislative Chairman, D.C. Retired Teachers Ass'n
Mrs. Mary Kochke, D. C. State Director for Nat'l Retired Teachers Ass'n
Mr. Norman S. Anthony, President of School Officers, Local #4
Mr. William H. Simons, President, Washington Teachers Union
Mrs. Ellen Datcher, N.E.A. State Director for the District of Columbia
Mr. Jack Tennant, Retirement Consultant, N.E.A.

(More)

We will be glad to notify the above group of a meeting which you may schedule if you wish us to do so.

You may be assured of our interest in forward-looking plans for our city and of our eagerness to be informed on the crucial issues facing us.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth D. Griffith
President
District of Columbia Retired
Teachers Association
3601 Connecticut Ave., N.W., 20008

Roberta S. Barnes
Legislative Chairman
District of Columbia Retired
Teachers Association
3145 Aberfoyle Place, N. W., 20015

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004

July 8, 1975

Walter E. Washington, Mayor
District Building
14th & E Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mayor Washington:

I am troubled by the recent announcement on modified summer hours for the Public Library system. The fact that all libraries will be closed on all weekends during the summer months is causing me and a number of my colleagues serious concern.

I strongly urge that alternate schedules be explored in order that the libraries could be open to the public on either Saturday, Sunday, or part of both days of the weekend. For many citizens, their only opportunity to use the libraries is during the evening or weekend hours. While statistics may demonstrate that a lower rate of usage characterizes summer weekend hours, the critical issue of weekend access must be addressed. I would suggest that opening on a half-day basis on both Saturday and Sunday could be arranged at the Martin Luther King Library, as well as a similar arrangement for one library in each service area or ward.

As Chairperson of the Committee on Education, Recreation, and Youth Affairs, I am well aware of the severe budgetary constraints which face the Library system. Nevertheless, a flexible approach to scheduled hours may well be possible despite the limited funds available - certainly on a trial basis. Adequate library services are integral to the District of Columbia's educational, cultural, and recreational services

and critical to young people during the summer. I hope you will fully investigate such options as soon as possible. Because the summer has begun, your prompt attention to this request will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Julius W. Hobson

JULIUS W. HOBSON, Chairman
Committee on Education, Recreation,
and Youth Affairs

cc: Councilmembers

November 22, 1976

Honorable Walter Washington
Mayor
District of Columbia
The District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mayor Washington:

I regret I will be unable to attend your Annual Prayer Breakfast on December 1, 1976. Thank you for the invitation.

Sincerely,

Julius W. Hobson
Councilman at Large

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUANCE SYSTEM

Mayor's Memorandum 76-170
November 9, 1976

TO: HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

ORIGINATOR: Martin K. Schaller, Executive Secretary, D.C.

SUBJECT: Mayor's Prayer Breakfast

The Mayor's Annual Prayer Breakfast will be held this year on Wednesday, December 1, 1976 at 8:00 a.m. in the International Ballroom Center of the Washington Hilton Hotel. I have enclosed for distribution to interested employees in your department a small supply of invitations. Reservations at $7.00 per person should be returned to the Mayor's Prayer Breakfast Committee in the enclosed envelope by November 24th. Reservations may also be made by telephone by calling 234-3240. We hope that you and others on your staff will be able to join with the Mayor in this Breakfast.

If you need any additional invitations, please let me know. We look forward to seeing you at the Mayor's Prayer Breakfast.

Enclosures

EXPIRATION DATE: December 15, 1976

Mail Routing Slip

Date: 11/15

To: Councilmember Julius Hobson

Comments: Most Council members attend (usually) L

INSTRUCTIONS TO STAFF:

PAT SANDY DAVID CLEO INTERNS:

LORRAINE (Circle Name)

If any staff wish to attend - feel free to do so. !! Not

Julius.

Mayors Prayer Breakfast Committee
1001 Fourteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

You are cordially invited to the annual

Mayor's Prayer Breakfast

with

The Honorable Walter E. Washington

and the

Leadership of the District of Columbia

Wednesday, December 1, 1976

at eight o'clock

Guests to be seated by 7:50 a.m.

International Ballroom Center

The Washington Hilton

R.S.V.P.
by November 24
(card enclosed)

Adjournment
by 9:15 a.m.

and Youth Affairs

MAYOR'S PRAYER BREAKFAST COMMITTEE

1001 Fourteenth Street, N.W.

Washington, D. C. 20005

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004

JULIUS W. HOBSON
Councilman at Large

February 22, 1977

Honorable

Mayor Walter Washington
District Building
14th and E Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mayor Washington:

On July 20, 1976, the Council of the District of Columbia adopted Resolution 1-343, "School Cost Center Reporting Resolution", which required detailed cost information on a quarterly basis concerning the public school system.

Section 4 of the resolution provides for an initial report to the Council of the city's plans and progress toward the full implementation of the resolution; it further specifies that the first report should be provided by August 15, 1976. Subsequent reports were due on October 15, 1976 and January 15, 1977. To date, no reports or communications have been received by the Council or the Committee on Education, Recreation, and Youth Affairs, as mandated by Resolution 1-343.

At its third regular meeting, Council Period Two, February 15, 1977, the Committee on Education, Recreation, and Youth Affairs approved the attached motion which requests immediate response by the Executive.

While I understand that the Office of Budget and Management Systems is currently working on the implementation of the resolution, I and other members of the Committee on Education, Recreation, and Youth Affairs are disturbed that no formal response has been received from your office.

Please advise the Committee when we can expect the reports required by Resolution 1-343, pursuant to the authority granted the Council in Section 448 of the Charter.

Sincerely,

Julius W. Hobson
Chairman, Committee on Education, Recreation,
and Youth Affairs

cc: Councilmembers
Mr. Edward Webb, General Counsel
Mr. John Risher, Corporation Counsel
Dr. Therman Evans, President, Board of Education

February 22, 1977

Honorable Walter Washington
Mayor
District of Columbia
City Hall
14th and E Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mayor Washington:

On July 20, 1976, the Council of the District of Columbia adopted Resolution 1-343, "School Cost Center Reporting Resolution", which required detailed cost information on a quarterly basis concerning the public school system.

Section 4 of the resolution provides for an initial report to the Council of the city's plans and progress toward the full implementation of the resolution; it further specifies that the first report should be provided by August 15, 1976. Subsequent reports were due on October 15, 1976 and January 15, 1977. To date, no reports or communications have been received by the Council or the Committee on Education, Recreation, and Youth Affairs, as mandated by Resolution 1-343.

At its third regular meeting, Council Period Two, February 15, 1977, the Committee on Education, Recreation and Youth Affairs approved the attached motion which requests immediate response by the Executive.

While I understand that the Office of Budget and Management Systems is currently working on the implementation of the resolution, I and other members of the Committee on Education, Recreation and Youth Affairs are disturbed that no formal response has been received from your office.

Please advise the Committee when we can expect the reports required by Resolution 1-343, pursuant to the authority granted the Council in Section 448 of the Charter.

Sincerely,

Julius W. Hobson
Chairman
Committee on Education, Recreation & Youth Affairs

cc: Councilmembers, Mr. Edward Webb, General Counsel
Mr. John Risher, Corporation Counsel, Dr. Therman Evans, President, Board of Education